DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER RECENT SUMMIT-LEVEL TALKS HELD BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN IN AGRA (Contd.)

श्री अवनि राय (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : धन्यवाद, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी। आगरा शिखर-वार्ता में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो बयान इस सदन में रखा है, उस पर स्पष्टीकरण के लिए मैं कुछ बातें सदन के सामने रख रहा हूं। यद्यपि बोलने वाले बहुत थे और 'प्राइवेट मैम्बर बिल डे ' के नाते समय भी कम है इसलिए मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा। लेकिन कुछ बातें सामने रखूंगा। पहली बात तो आगरा शिखर बैठक की सफलता और विफलता के बारे मे है। सफलता क्या पाई, यह हमें मालूम नहीं है, लेकिन विफलता तो है ही। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक सर्वदलीय बैठक 9 जुलाई को बुलाई थी और उसमें हमने अपनी पार्टी आरएसपी की ओर से कहा कि हमारी पार्टी को ऐसी उम्मीद नहीं है कि एक- दो वार्तालाप में झट से कश्मीर का मामला और कश्मीर की समस्या हल हो जाएगी, लेकिन वार्तालाप जारी रहनी चाहिए। सर्वदलीय बैठक में हमने प्रधान मंत्री जी को खासतौर पर कहा था और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी जिक्र किया था कि उनके साथ वार्ता के समय पीपल टू पीपल मूव करेंगे, एज्युकेशन, कल्चर आदि का अगर दोनों देशों में लेन-देन होगा तो एक सौहार्दपूर्ण व्यवस्था बनेगी। उसी व्यवस्था के जरिए यह समस्या आगे हल हो सकती है। यहां बहस में भाग लेते हुए सरकारी पक्ष की ओर से बार-बार यह दोहराया गया है कि मुशर्रफ जी ने क्या -क्या किया। लेकिन इस बात पर जोर नहीं दिया है कि कहां हमारी कमियां हैं और कहां हमारी गलतियां है, यह बैठक क्यों हुई और किसके इशारे पर हुई। यह बात तो जरूर है कि जो क्लीपिंग्ज हमारी संसद की लाइब्रेरी में है उसको देखा जाए तो पता चलेगा कि उसी में बहुत कुछ लिखा है। सरकार को उस पर ध्यान देना चाहिए। उसमें यह भी लिखा है कि यहां आने से पहले पाकिस्तान के विदेश मंत्री बैठक के बारे में, अमरीका जाकर कैसे बात करके आए। उसमें यह भी है कि परवेज मुशर्रफ यहां आकर कौन से ईशू को सामने रखेंगे। उसी में उन्होंने जाहिर कर दिया कि कश्मीर का मामला उनके सामने प्रधान विषय होगा। यह सब जानते हुए भी हमारी सरकार कश्मीर को लेकर उनके सामने हिम्मत से यह नहीं कह पाई कि कश्मीर हमारे देश का अटूट अंग है और इस विषय पर हम किसी के साथ आलोचना में नहीं हैं और आप इस विषय को यहीं पर समाप्त कर दीजिए। बल्कि उन्होंने हमारे देश मे यह भी कहा कि यहां जो हरकते हो रही हैं, आतंकवादियों को जो प्रश्रय दिया जाता है, वे टेरेरिस्ट आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे हैं। क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूं कि उस वक्त यह सरकार खामोशी से यह क्यों सुन रही थी? किसकी आजादी? किस देश की आजादी वे मांग रहे हैं? किस देश की आजादी के लिए वे मुक्तिवाहिनी या स्वतंत्रता सेनानियों के बारे में कह रहे थे? यदि यह कश्मीर है तो उसे आजाद कराने का हक पाकिस्तान का नहीं है, यह हक हमारा है। अगर सरकार यह सब नहीं बोल पाई तो यह सरकार का कुसूर है। इसी के साथ मैं एक और चीज दोहराना चाहता हूं कि जब पार्लियामेंट के दोनों सदनों को मिलाकर सैंट्रल हाल में आमंत्रित अतिथि प्रेजीडेंट क्लिंटन आए थे तो हमारी पार्टी ने उस सभा का बायकाट किया था लेकिन उस सभा में जितने सदस्य थे, उन भारत के वासियों से, सांसदों से, प्रेजिडेंट क्लिंटन ने हॉल में भाषण देते हुए कहा था कि Kashmir is a disputed area. मैं अफसोस के साथ कहता हूं कि उस वक्त किसी सांसद ने खड़े होकर यह नहीं कहा कि It is not disputed. It is a part of our country. यह मैं अफसोस के साथ कह रहा हूं। बल्कि भाषण देने के बाद क्लिंटन के साथ कौन, कैसे हाथ मिलाएगा इसके लिए वहां मारा-पिटी होने लगी थी। We have not that courage to say that it is our land, and nobody

has any right to say anything. We are talking of Kashmir, we are talking of our nation, we are talking of our motherland! हम यहां बैठकर भाषण देते हैं, इतने गंभीर मामले पर बातें हो रही हैं पर सदन की हालत यह है कि ऐसे गंभीर मामले पर भी सांसद की संख्या पूरी नहीं हैं। कौन क्या कहता है, क्या नहीं कहता है, किसी पार्टी का क्या मत है यह सुनने के लिए सरकारी पक्ष को यहां होना चाहिए था। सवाल यह है - मैं अपने प्रधानमंत्री जी का विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूं, उन्होंने जो बात कही है, बात करने के लिए जो प्रयास जारी रखा है मैं उसका अभिनन्दन करता हूं लेकिन बात कैसे कहें, किस तरह से कहें, अगर हमारे देश में आकर कोई ऐसा कहकर चला जाए कि वे आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं तो मैं यह किसी भी ढंग से बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूं। जब पूरा देश हमारे साथ है, मैं राजनीतिक पार्टियों की बात नहीं कर रहा हूं, कश्मीर के मामले में जब भी कोई लड़ाई हुई है तो पूरा देश आगे बढ़कर आया है और जब पूरा देश हमारे साथ है, देशवासी हमारे साथ हैं तो हम कह सकते हैं कि इस पर कोई बहस नहीं होगी। इसके साथ-साथ प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा कि दोनों देश के बीच सुसंपर्क हों इसके प्रयास होंगे। सुसंपर्क बनाने के लिए हम जो चाहते थे उसका हमने दुनिया के सामने ठीक ढंग से प्रचार नहीं किया। बल्कि प्रचार माध्यमों का उन्होंने (पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति) इस्तेमाल किया और दुनिया के सामने उन्होंने जाहिर कर दिया कि कश्मीर को लेकर झगड़ा है और कश्मीर में उनका अंश है। उन्होंने यह ऐलान कर दिया कि कश्मीर पर जो आतंकवाद चल रहा है, उनको जो हम समर्थन दे रहे हैं वह ठीक कर रहे हैं। मैं सोचता हूं और मेरी पार्टी भी सोचती है कि इस प्रकार की घोषणा को बढ़ावा देना उचित नहीं होगा। साथ ही साथ जो आतंकवाद कश्मीर में पनप रहा है, उसका भी हम मुकाबला नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। जिस ढंग से इस मामले पर पहल होनी चाहिए वह हम नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। साथ ही मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अगर हम अपने साथी देशों के साथ दोस्ताना चाहते हैं, उनके साथ मिलजुल कर रहना चाहते हैं और एक शांतिपूर्ण माहौल बनाना चाहते हैं तो हमें देश के अंदर जो फूट डालने वाले लोग हैं, जो धर्म के नाम पर ज्यादा घिनौना शब्द इस्तेमाल करते हैं वह ऐसा न करें, वह दूसरे धर्म के लोगों पर अत्याचार न करें और हमारी जो धर्मनिरपेक्ष नीति है, उसको सामने रखते हुए यह जो साम्प्रदायिक संगठन या कोई भी व्यक्ति इस प्रकार की फूट डालने की कोशिश करता है, उनके साथ भी वैसा ही व्यवहार करना चाहिए जैसा हम आतंकवादियों के साथ करते हैं। अगर ऐसा नहीं होगा तो आतंकवाद यहां भी फैल जाएगा। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि भाईचारा बनाने के लिए, माहौल बनाने के लिए यह करना जरूरी है। ऐसा माहौल पूरे देश के अंदर बनना चाहिए और किसी भी धर्म पर आघात न लगे ऐसी कोशिश करनी चाहिए। इसके लिए हमें सब को विश्वास में लेना पड़ेगा। अगर सब लोगों में एक-सा विश्वास पैदा होगा तो भारत एक होकर अपनी पालिसी के हिसाब से चल सकेगा, आगे बढ़ सकेगा और दोस्ताना संबंध कायम रख सकेगा। इसलिए मैं सरकार से दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि वार्तालाप के साथ-साथ आप एक ऐसा माहौल अपने देश में भी बनायें जिससे देश में किसी भी धर्म के ऊपर, किसी भी जाति के ऊपर हम ऐसे शब्द का इस्तेमाल न करें जिससे हमारे अंदर खुद फूट पड़ जाए और देशवासियों के बीच मतान्तर या मनान्तर हो जाए। यह नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर यह हो जाए तो हमारे पूरे देशवासी देश के अंदर और देश के बाहर भी एक भाईचारा बना सकेंगे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Shri Rajeev Shukla. Not present. Shri R.S. Gavai. Not present. Shri D.P. Yadav. Not present. Shri Eduardo Faleiro. Not present. Dr. M.N. Das.

DR. M.N. DAS (Orissa): Sir, I think I am the last speaker.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): You are not the last speaker. You are the last but one speaker.

DR. M.N. DAS: Sir, I can talk about the Kashmir affairs at some length, but there may be constraint of time. First of all, I give the maximum credit to Sher-e-Kashmir, Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah. I am not going into the details of Kashmir affairs. On 15th July this year, after five hours of discussion with our hon. Prime Minister, President Pervez Musharraf went to his room and at midnight searched for a dictionary to find the meaning of two words "dispute" and "problem". What did he discover? The meaning of the word "problem" is something which concerns ones own self. The meaning of the word "dispute" is that it is a conflict between two persons or two parties or two countries.

Who was the author of the Kashmir problem? Kashmir is not India's problem. Who was the real author of the Kashmir problem? Gen. Musharraf says, "It is not his problem. It is not his country's problem." I challenge him to answer a question. Kashmir is a problem of Pakistan, created by Pakistan, created by the father of Pakistan, Mohd. Ali Jinnah. I would like to refer to a document. There is no time to go into details. During all those days of discussion about partition of India Jinnah demanded that his ambitious scheme of a greater Pakistan with whole of the Punjab in the West and whole of Bengal and Assam, including Calcutta in the East, should become part and parcel of Pakistan. But when that bubble of hope burst, he almost drove himself to madness. Then he thought of another sinister move. During all those days of discussion he never mentioned Kashmir, though in the word 'Pakistan' 'P' stands for Punjab, 'A' stands for Afghan, i.e. the North-West Frontier Province, 'K' stands for Kashmir, 'S' stands for Sindh and 'Tan' stands for Baluchistan. But during the discussion on partition, he never uttered the word 'Kashmir'. Why did not he do so? He did not do it because Sheikh Muhammed Abdullah did not allow Jinnah to enter into Kashmir. He did not allow Jinnah to form a Muslim League in Kashmir. Why? Because he stood for the one-nation theory. He stood for the Kashmiryat. He stood solidly behind Mahatma Gandhi, Pt. Nehru and the Congress, and said that in no case Jinnah would enter Kashmir and in no case Kashmir would be a subject-matter of discussion in the partition plan. After going mad by getting the moth eaten and truncated Pakistan, what did Jinnah want? He wanted to balkanise India. He thought that the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Nawab of Bhopal and

the Nawab of Rampur, etc. would accede to Pakistan. I would like to refer to a document, 'Jinnah's own words'. In a crucial meeting after Pakistan plan was accepted, the British Parliament was in a hurry to pass the Indian Independence Act. There was no time. On 3rd June, 1947, the partition plan was finalised and on 4th June, Viceroy Mountbatten declared that independence would be granted on 15th August. But the British Parliament insisted that they have to first formalise everything and then only the British Parliament would pass the Indian Independence Act and both the countries would come into existence thereafter. So a crucial meeting was held on 13th June. On the one side, there were Mohd. Ali Jinnah, Liaquat Ali Khan and Abdur Rab Nistar and on the other side, there were Pt. Nehru, Sardar Patel, Acharya Kriplani and Baldev Singh, who represented the Sikh community. The Viceroy presided over the meeting and the Head of the Political Department managing all the 565 Princely States was also present. In that meeting Jinnah demanded, "All the Indian States are sovereign States. The States will decide, the rulers of the States would decide whether to join Pakistan or India." He persisted. Pt. Nehru challenged it and asked: "What were the tests of sovereignty? One test was the capacity for international relations, whereas the States of India had no such power. The second was the capacity for declaring a war against another State.

But the Indian princes had no such power. And, in that long-drawn out battle of argument, Jinnah finally won the day and he wanted that the Indian princess should decide their own future, whether to join Pakistan or India. Out of the 565 princely States, 563 princely States agreed to join the Indian Union on or before 15th August, 1947. Hyderabad did not join Pakistan even though Jinnah wanted that Hyderabad should join Pakistan. But Hyderabad, with a territory and population as big as France, wanted to remain independent. And, when Kashmir also remained independent, Jinnah thought, because the word 'K' stands for 'Kashmir', he must invade it. But, by that time, the entire Muslim population of Kashmir, under the leadership of Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah declared that they reject Jinnahas two-nation theory, that they stand for the one-nation theory, and that they will never accede to Pakistan. Then, the tribals were sent; the Pak armies were sent to invade Kashmir. Then, Maharaja Hari Singh signed the Instrument of Accession, and Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah stood by him. So, Sir, if Kashmir problem is a big problem, it was created by Jinnah who demanded that all the princes of India should be regarded as independent, sovereign, rulers to decide their future.

Now, my humble submission to you here is this. In spite of Sushmaji's emotionally surcharged powerful, speech, in spite of the arguments of the hon. Minister of External Affairs to create conviction in our minds, we, in Parliament, cannot pre-empt the verdict of the future on Vajpayeeji. We have to wait for the future to pass the verdict. I have the premonition that the verdict will be more pathetic and sad. In spite of Vajpayeeji's peace offers, extension of ceasefire, earlier Lahore bus trip and all that, ultimately, what did you do? Whom did you invite? Before you invite somebody, you must know the background of that person, his principles, his personality and his policies. Is it not a fact that this Pervez Musharraf, who as a Junior Army Officer in 1971, trained Naga insurgents in the deep and dense forests of Chittagong to create subversive activities in the North-East? Is it not a fact that this very Musharraf butchered Bengalies, suspecting them to be pro-Indians? Did he not fight against the Indian Army fanatically? When Dhaka fell, 92,000 Pakistani soldiers were taken Prisoners of War, and, when General A.A.K. Niazi of Pakistan signed the Treaty of surrender before General Jagjit Singh Aarora of India, what was Musharraf doing at that time? He was keeping his palm on the Holy Koran, swearing in the name of Allah, that he would avenge this defeat in East Pakistan and that since India liberated East Pakistan and created Bangladesh, he would acquire Kashmir. Twenty-eight years after that, Pervez Musharraf became the Chief of Army Staff in Pakistan. And, when Vajpayeeji was going on the Lahore bus trip, it was this man who, without the permission of the then Pakistani Prime Minister, managed to send his soldiers to the heights of Kargil. And, after the defeat at Kargil, how did he explain that defeat to his Armymen, to his fundamentalist followers, to his Jehadis? He said that Kargil was a tactical step.

"We took one step to draw the Indian army to the Kargil heights so that we could push into the Kashmir Valley and the other parts of Kashmir and, through Kashmir, into India". Thousands of infiltrators, intruders, Talibanised mercenaries, jehadis and terrorists! "So, we retraced one step, but we have advanced four steps". That is the explanation Pervez Musharraf gave to his people. And we are inviting that man! Madam Sushma Swaraj, kindly excuse me. The future would compare your Prime Minister with Neville Chamberlain of Great Britain, whose offers of peace turned into a policy of appeasement. He wanted to appease Adolf Hitler, the Nazi dictator.Of course, our Prime Minister was not talking to a big dictator like Adolf Hitler. General Pervez Musharraf is a miniature figure of Hitler. Whom did you send the invitation to? You sent it to the Chief

6.00 P.M.

Executive of Pakistan. When he got the invitation from the Prime Minister of the largest democratic nation, he coronated himself with the presidentship. We spread red carpet to receive him. According to his claim, for 95% of the time, he persisted with raising the 'core' issue of Kashmir and saying that Kashmir was a dispute. Who created this dispute? Jinnah was the author of Pakistan and the Kashmir problem. And successive Governments of Pakistan were the authors of the Kashmir 'dispute'. When Jinnah spoke words of hostility, Sardar Patel mentioned in one sentence, "A friendly Pakistan would be amalgamated; a hostile Pakistan should be eliminated". That silenced Mohammad Ali Jinnah. When Liaquat Ali came to power, he showed clenched fists to India -- a symbol of hostility. Nehru responded with sending the Army to the frontier. When Liaquat protested, what was Nehru's answer? He said, "You show us clenched fists. Are we going to respond with a handshake? We will respond with bayonets". He stopped. Ayub Khan misadventured in the Rann of Kachh.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Please conclude now.

DR. M. N. DAS: Shastriji taught a lesson. Now, I give these examples for one reason. If you want to have further dialogue with Pakistan, talk in terms of strength, talk as the representative head of the largest democratic nation. Do not go for dialogue as a sub-State; go as a strong State, as a super-State, as a tough State. That is my humble request. I am sure -- my good friend Shri Sharief-uddin and Hon'ble Shri Omar Abdulla are here -- Kashmiriyat will continue. One nation theory will continue in India, as long as India exists and Kashmir exists. Pakistan can never dream of getting Kashmir, even an inch of Kashmir. I have no time to show what the Indian Independence Act said. What did it contain? What did it define? It said that those parts which seceded from the Indian mainland, formed Pakistan; rest of the historical India remained as India. The historical entity of India is not touched thereby; only those parts which seceded formed Pakistan. So, Kashmir did not secede. The historic India contained Kashmir and the rest of India. So, India remained eternal India. Pakistan disintegrated within 25 years. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto might have declared a thousand year war against India, but his Army ultimately hanged him. So, Kashmir is not our problem. It is not our dispute with Pakistan. We want friendship with the Pakistani people, but not at the cost of honour, dignity and prestige of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Shri Satish Pradhan is absent. Shri Bratin Sen Gupta.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the issue is too serious and should be addressed immediately, instead of evading which has been going on for the last fifty years, particularly, internationally. Sir, by now, it is known to all of us that the damage and lapse on our part has caused us very dearly, particularly, in the international arena. The President, who was our guest, has said -- instead of calling them terrorists and mercenaries who are attacking our people in Amarnath, in Kashmir and everywhere else -- that they are not mercenaries; they are not terrorists; they are not from Pakistan. He has described them as indigenous freedom fighters of India. He has equated the terrorists and extremists with the battle and soldiers of Palestine, with the battle of Kosovo, with the battle of other countries, where the cause is, fighting for self-determination. The guest has said that it is because of India that the Summit broke down. After going back to Pakistan, the guest said that the Summit broke down entirely because of misleading statements from the Indian side. Certainly, this was targeted not only at the Pakistani constituency, the constituency of our neighbour, it was also targeted at the international constituency, it was targeted at international diplomacy. After the damage and lapse which have somehow occurred, I do not know whether the Government and the hon. Minister have reviewed it because, generally, in such kind of serious cases, the Prime Minister and the Ministers are supposed to be guided by the top level of ministerial bureaucracy, in this case, the External Affairs Ministry. I want to know whether that assessment was already there with us. Or, even after going back to Pakistan, when the Pakistani President had uttered all these words, whether assertive international diplomatic initiative had been undertaken by our bureaucracy in the international fora in which they participated. I want to know whether the Government has made an assessment of it so that these wrong and false accusations could be properly countered. All of us know that when the Prime Minister, point-blank, asked the question about the prisoners of war -- which is a very pathetic issue, who have, for more than 20 years, been suffering in Pakistani jails -- to the President, he told a blatant untruth and said that there were no prisoners of war in Pakistan. Everybody knows, not only in India, but also everywhere, that there cannot be a more blatant untruth than this. But, unfortunately, it was stated by our guest. I want to know what counter-argument was made by India, by showing them all kinds of statistics and documents and proofs that the

Government has got in this regard. I want to know whether that homework was done subsequently, at least, to prove before the international community that this is a wrong statement and our senior generals and armymen are languishing like anything in Pakistani jails for years and their Government is not recognising it and telling a blatant untruth.

Sir, after Lahore, Kargil happened. After this Agra Summit, we have seen what is happening, in series. We have seen the killings of *Amarnath yatris* and we have seen what happened in Doda. I am not here to cry as an ultra-nationalist or to evoke any jingoistic ultra-nationalist fervour over here. But, something called self-dignity of a nation is a fundamental right of a country; something called self-prestige of a nation is involved here. Every time, the guest said that the Line of Control is a disputed area. I want to know whether we countered it internationally or not. For all these 50 years, these issues have again and again been raked up by all these people. Even a few years back, there was a mention in the Pakistan Assembly that there was no solution other than balkanisation of India. It was quoted there indirectly. I want to know whether proper homework has been done by the Government and the bureaucracy to counter such conspiratorial intentions made in the statement internationally. These statements smell fully of conspiracy. Our guest is targeting the international audience to publicise their views. I want to know whether we are also targeting the international constituency in an assertive manner so that we could have said to the international community that "the Kashmir issue is a fait accompli; it is a part of India. All these issues of mercenaries, terrorists, Line of Control, etc., are fait accompli, not from today, but for the last fifty four years; still our neighbour has been raising these issues and certain international support, on occasions, was given to it. This is unfair to our country".

This is unfair against our country. I would like to know whether we could make this assertion or not. Sir, lastly, I want to know whether we did not know that the guest who was coming to us -- with all fairness to him, with all respect to him, with all humility to him -- that he was the architect of the Kargil War. Did we not know that after usurping presidency, he was trying to utilise this opportunity to legitimise his presidency which was not accepted by then by the Pakistani system? Given this background, I would like to know whether the senior officials of the External Affairs Ministry were adequately alert about this aspect and did their homework accordingly. I do not want to take much of your time. *...(Interruptions)...* Nobody has a right to question us on this issue. But they are continuously

raising this question in the Press and on other international forums. Many of our neighbours are silent on this issue. We do not want this question to remain unanswered like this. The Government should be much more assertive. Otherwise, this will remain as another unanswered question and as equal a mystery as the detaining and the arrest of Sheikh Abudullah without trial was in Kashmir in 1953. So, it should not be so. I want categorical answer from the Government on these issues in the interest of self-dignity of our country. I am not here to evoke ultra nationalist ideology or jingoism here. But for the prestige of the country, these questions should be properly answered by the bureaucracy of the Ministry of External Affairs who were supposed to guide the hon. Prime Minister before the Agra Summit. Thank you.

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Sir, I want to take only a minute. ...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : इसी संदर्भ में है या कोई और बात कहनी है?

श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिआ : इसी संदर्भ में है।

Sir, today in an article in **The Indian Express,** J.N. Dixit has written that Vajpayee aptly assessed Pakistan's India policy and in his address to the National Executive of the BJP on 28th July stated that Musharraf came to Agra as a military man. ...*(Interruptions)*...

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह क्या है? कोई पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन है, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, यह पता तो लगे कि क्या है? क्या ऐसे कोई भी सदस्य खड़ा होकर कुछ भी बोलने लगेगा? आखिरकार यह सदन कुछ नियमों और क़ायदों के अनुसार चलता है। पहले पूछिए तो उनसे कि वे किस बारे में बोल रहे हैं - कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहे हैं, कोई पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनेशन दे रहे हैं?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : आप क्या कहना चाह रहे हैं?

श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिआ : आगरा सम्मिट के बारे में हमारा कहना यह है कि वाजपेयी साहब ने यह बोला है कि आगरा सम्मिट में मुशर्रफ ऐज़ ऐ मिलिट्रीमैन आया था **...(व्यवधान)...** How could Prime Minister recognise Musharraf as the President of Pakistan when he himself is saying that he came as a military man? ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : आप इनको भाषण की अनुमति दे रहे हैं, लेकिन यह तो पता लगे कि यह किस बारे में बोल रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : खूंटिआ जी, हो गई आपकी बात। Please take your seat.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : किसी आर्टिकल को उठाकर के कुछ भी पूछ रहे हैं, बिना किसी नियम के खड़े हो रहे हैं, ऐसे थोड़ा सदन चलता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : कृपया बैठिए।

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा आगरा में भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो शिखर वार्ता हुई, उसके संबंध में जो चर्चा थी, वह चर्चा समाप्त हुई और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी 13 अगस्त, 2001 को प्रश्न काल के बाद इसका जवाब देंगे।

अब सदन की कार्रवाई सोमवार, दिनांक 13.08.2001 को पूर्वाह्न 11:00 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned at nine minutes past six of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 13th August, 2001.